DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 107 740 UD 015 269

AUTHOR Jacobson, Cardell K.
TITLE Some Effects of Inter-Group Contact Among Black, White, and Latin Milwaukee Students.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.; Wisconsin Univ., Milwaukee. Language and Area Center for Latin America.
PUB DATE Feb 75
NOTE 52p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Anti Social Behavior; Caucasian Students; Family Background; Longitudinal Studies; Negro Students; Peer Groups; Political Attitudes; *Race Relations; Racial Attitudes; *Racial Balance; Socioeconomic Status; Spanish Speaking; *Student Attitudes; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS Milwaukee; Wisconsin

ABSTRACT

This study focuses on several questions about racial and ethnic contact in the Milwaukee Public Schools: the kinds of good intraracial and intraethnic contact that have occurred; how much of the conflict is interracial and how much is intraracial; when conflict occurs, which members of the groups are victimized; who the victims of thefts are; who are assaulted, embarrassed, humiliated, or put down because of race, ethnic origin, physical characteristics, or ability. The effects of this conflict and victimization may have on the students' subsequent attitudes and feelings, their career choices, and their academic performance are examined. Also examined are the socioeconomic and educational backgrounds of the parents. A second group of questions concern the effects that racial conflict and other school experiences have in drawing or driving students into integrationist versus separatist (segregationist) positions. This study is based on a longitudinal design in which the same students have been interviewed and will be re-interviewed two times more during two different years. In this report, the correlates of separatist versus integrationist sentiments are discussed, but the direction of causality is held to be undeterminable until further accumulation of data. (Author/JM)

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Cardell K. Jacobson

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

Not for quotation or citation without written permission of the author

ED107740

SOME EFFECTS OF INTER-GROUP CONTACT AMONG BLACK, WHITE, AND LATIN MILWAUKEE STUDENTS*

Preliminary report to the participants and others of a study conducted in selected Milwaukee schools by

Cardell K. Jacobson

Department of Sociology
University of Wisconsin--Milwaukee
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

February, 1975

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD 015269

*The research reported herein was supported primarily by a Grant from the National Institute of Education (NE-G-00-3-0053), but supplemental funds were provided by the Center for Latin America, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

C O N T E N T S

Acknowledgements	preface
Introduction	1
Method	4
Sample: Schools	4
Sample: Students.	5
Results	6
Pattern of Intergroup Contact	6
Cooperation and Conflict in the Schools . .	8
Summary	18
Correlates of Intergroup Polarization	20
Summary	34

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Participating Schools	4A*
Table 2	Parental Socio-economic Status and Educational Level	7A
Table 3	Students reporting Good, Bad, and Mixed Race Relations	8A
Table 4	Students Having Friends of Another Group	10A
Table 5	Proportion of Students who Reported Hearing of Fighting	13A
Table 6	Students reporting Involvement in Fighting	14A
Table 7	Reported Stealing and Threats	16A
Table 8	Student Experience with Threats	17A
Table 9	Student Recognition of Minority Organizations and Individuals	22A
Table 10	Student Preference for School Composed Primarily of Students of Same Group	24A
Table 11	Factor Analysis of Students Attitudes about Intergroup Relations	28A
Table 12	Correlates of Integration - Separatism and Avoidance-Approach Dimensions	30A

* The table pages are not numbered but follow the numerical pages list here.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would especially like to thank G. Dwight Rowe, Executive Director, Department of Educational Research and Program Assessment and all of the participating principals for the cooperation they extended to the researchers, for allowing us to do the study in their schools, and for making their facilities available to us. All were extremely cooperative and professional. Thanks also go to the many teachers whose classes and schedules were interrupted or changed, but who were helpful and cooperative. They displayed a healthy curiosity about the study. I would like also to thank the interviewers who diligently helped in the data collection and especially JoAnn Hanson who served as the primary research assistant of the project. Finally, I am grateful to the students who took the time to answer our questions and fill out their part of the questionnaires. They were delightful and enjoyable to work with. Finally, I would like to thank Donald L. Noel and Richard A. Henry for reading and commenting on an earlier version of this report.

This preliminary report has been prepared as faithfully to the facts as possible. However, any comments, suggestions or criticisms are welcome and are encouraged.

Those of us in American society who have lived through the last decade as adults have witnessed phenomenal changes in the nature of race and ethnic relations. We have seen the development of the civil rights movement, the black power movement, and the urban riots of 1964-1968. At the same time white citizen councils, the Klu Klux Klan and most recently the Socialists' White People's Party have arisen and opposed the gains that minority populations have made. Nevertheless, at the same time, numerous whites and blacks and members of other ethnic groups have been working together to bring about good "race relations." Unfortunately the conflict and opposition have received more attention than the cooperative efforts.

On both the junior and senior high school levels we have seen something of the same phenomenon. Attention has focused on racial and ethnic conflict rather than on cooperation within the schools. Within Milwaukee this past year the news media have emphasized the conflict that errupted at Kosciuszko Junior High and at Washirgton Senior High among other schools. Nevertheless, black and white and Latin students have again experienced both good and bad "race and ethnic relations" in these and other schools, and for the most part the good relations have been ignored by the news media. Furthermore the interracial (or ethnic) conflict has been emphasized while intra- or the same race conflict has been ignored or de-emphasized.

The problem of under-reporting certain behaviors and over-reporting others can be important. Often schools are stigmatized as bad schools when in fact, they may not be. Other schools may have more than their share of conflict, but for a variety of reasons the conflicts may not be publicized.

In this report specific schools will not be compared with other schools on the amount of conflict that has occurred.*** We shall, however, be concerned with the overall amount of conflict that occurs within the schools chosen in the sample, and how much of it is interracial and how much interracial. We shall also be concerned with the positive-how well the races accept one another--as well as the negative. Thus, we shall attempt to answer several questions about racial and ethnic contact in the Milwaukee Public Schools. What kinds of good intra-racial and intra-ethnic contact have occurred? How much of the conflict is inter-racial and how much is intra-racial? When conflict occurs, which members of the groups are victimized? Who are the victims of thefts? Who is assaulted, embarrassed, humiliated, or put down because of race, ethnic origin, physical characteristics or ability? And finally, we shall examine the effects this conflict and victimization has to have on the students' subsequent attitudes and feelings, their career choices, and their academic performance.

A second group of questions we shall attempt to answer in this report concerns the recruitment of students into particular philosophies regarding race relations. We shall be interested in the effects that racial conflict and other school experiences have in drawing or driving students into integrationist versus separatist (segregationist) positions. Essentially we shall try to determine the social correlates of integrationist vs. segregationist stances in the three racial and ethnic groups (black, white, Latin) examined in this study.

***This information is available from the researchers and will be provided to principals and to the administration should they request it. It must be recognized, however, that such comparisons must be limited to the schools in the sample. System-wide comparisons are not available.

A methodological note must be made here. This study is based on a longitudinal, over time (Panel) model in which the same students will be re-interviewed at three points in time during three different years. Much of the previous research in the area of racial conflict has been static in design; that is, student attitudes and experiences have been examined only once. Data have been collected on single groups at single points in time, or at best, on different groups at different times. This has not allowed the researchers to rule out selection (of particular types of students) as an explanation for the changes in racial attitudes and school performance that result from integrated and non-integrated school experiences. In this report we shall show the correlates of separatist vs. integrationist sentiments, but assessment of direction of causality will have to await further collection of data this year. These subsequent data will allow clearer assessment of changes in attitudes, performance, etc. These changes will be particularly important as the students move from junior high students move to high school and encounter student bodies of different racial proportions.

METHOD

Sample: Schools

Selection of the schools to be included in the sample was based primarily on two criteria. First, an attempt was made to obtain schools with a variety of racial and ethnic compositions. Secondly, both schools in which the racial or ethnic composition was constant and schools in which the composition was undergoing change were sought. All black, basically all white schools and those of mixed composition were included in the sample. An attempt was made to obtain cooperation of the high schools and the feeder junior and K-8 schools from the same area so that the socio-economic status of the students at both the junior high and the high school levels would be approximately the same. This facilitates comparisons between the students at the two ages. Eventually thirteen schools were selected for inclusion in the sample (five senior, five junior, and three K-8 schools). Four of these did not participate, primarily because of the inopportune time and the lateness in the school year. Listed in Table 1 are the schools that participated, along with the racial or ethnic composition of the schools. The number of students of each racial or ethnic group who participated (i.e. were interviewed) is also listed.

TABLE 1

Participating Schools: Racial Identity Study, Spring, 1974

School	Ethnic-Racial Composition[a]		Number of Students Participating
No. Division High School	Black[b]	100%	54
So. Division High School	White[d]	78.8%	63
	Latin[c]	17.6%	48
Washington High School	Black	45.7%	53
	White	51.6%	43
Madison High School	White	94.6%	58
Kosciuszko Junior High School	White	72.0%	31
	Black	24.4%	33
Burroughs Junior High School	White	93.4	56[e]
Vieau (K-8)	White	23.9%	16
	Latin	70.7%	33
Maryland (K-8)	White	84.7%	35[e]
	Black	8.6%	
Fratney (K-8)	White	61.6%	24[e]
	Black	26.1%	
		TOTAL	547

[a] Computed from "Enrollment by Ethnic Categories and schools as of October 1, 1973" reported by Milwaukee Public Schools.

[b] Defined by the Enrollment report as "Persons considered by themselves, by the school, or by the community to be Black or of African or Negro origin."

[c] Defined by the Enrollment report as "Persons considered by themselves, by the school, or by the community to be of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Central-American, Cuban, Latin-American, or other Spanish origin.

[d] All individuals not included as American Indian, Black, Asian American, Spanish Surnamed-American in the Ethnic Enrollment report.

[e] These schools were chosen as basically white schools. However, students within the schools were randomly selected which resulted in some minority students in the samples from these schools. These students were selected out and grouped with "blacks in mixed schools" for the analyses which follow

Sample: Students

To control for age differences and allow clearer comparisons between students in different schools, only seventh and tenth grade students were included in the sample. To minimize disruptions to the schools, classrooms rather than individual students were used as the basis for selection except at Washington High, South Division High, and Kozciuszko. At the latter two schools the Latin students were over sampled (relative to the white students) so that a reasonable number appeared in the final sample. This allowed for a more adequate comparison of the two groups. At Washington High a random sample of all tenth graders was obtained. This selection procedure proved to be difficult for two reasons, however. It necessitated working with numerous classrooms and teachers rather than a few, and secondly, student absences interferred with our schedules. At the remainder of the schools we therefore utilized classrooms rather than individual students as a basis for selection which greatly facilitated the data collection. In particular we were able to complete an interview with most of the absentees with a single return to classrooms, rather than repeated returns. This selection process may have restricted the representativeness of the sample, but probably not severely so. The importance of representative samples was emphasized to the principals and we asked them to give us representative classrooms in terms of (1) the breadth or range of students and (2) in terms of median or average classroom. Further, in the small schools all the students in the particular grade were included in the study. This increases our confidence that the students selected are repre[illegible]ive of the students within the schools in which we interviewed.

Once the sample had been selected, a letter describing the study was sent to the parents or guardian of each of the students informing them of their child's participation in the study. The letter described the study briefly and assured the parents of the anonymity of their child's responses. Finally, they were informed that if they so desired, their child would be dropped from the sample. Approximately one percent of the parents requested that their children be dropped from the sample.

Approximately one week later the students were asked to report to a pre-assigned area of the building, usually the cafeteria, but on occasion a vacant classroom or gymnasium where they were interviewed individually by a member of the research team. Whenever possible students were interviewed by someone of their own race and their own sex. Interviewers were trained before hand by the project director. The interviews averaged 20-25 minutes after which the students completed a four-page self-administered questionnaire which they completed in approximately ten minutes. A few students indicated that they did not wish to participate in the study and were dropped from the sample. The refusal rate was very low, however, and the students were very cooperative and interested in the study. The primary problem was absenteeism; the absentees were not easily scheduled or interviewed on subsequent occasions. As in most school related research, absentee students are probably under-represented in this study. In the follow-up study an attempt will be made to identify the frequently absent students and correct the results for the bias.

Results

Patterns of Intergroup Contact

For the major part of the analysis the total sample was subdivided on the basis of race or ethnicity (white, black, Latin), type of school in which they were enrolled (all white, all black, mixed white and black, mixed Anglo and Latin), and level of school (junior or senior high).

This resulted in the twelve categories listed in Table 2. Also included in Table 2 are two measures of perceived parental socio-economic status. The two measures are (1) the percent of the respondents who indicated that their father held upper level white collar or skilled blue collar jobs, and (2) the percent of their fathers who had taken any college or vocational training. On both indicators white parents of students in the basically all-white schools had the highest socio-economic status, followed by white parents of students in the mixed-black schools, and white parents of students in the mixed-Latin schools.

(TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE)

The blacks in the mixed white school had slightly higher status than blacks in the all-black schools, but significantly lower socio-economic status than whites in the mixed-black schools. Approximately the same percentage of Latins' parents had middle and upper status jobs as did the parents of the students in the all black schools, but they had lower educational levels than did the black parents. They also had significantly lower percentages on both indicators than the whites in the mixed-Latin schools. These differences are similar to those found in numerous other studies and are reported here only as a reminder that such differences must be taken into account in examining the results presented in the remainder of this report.

In general the status reported by the junior high school students is lower than that of the high school students from the same geographical area. For the most part this disparity results from a higher proportion of young students reporting that they did not know their parents occupational or educational level.

TABLE 2

Parental Socio-economic Status and Parental Educational Level by Race-School Categories

Race-School Category	Percent upper level white-collar and skilled blue-collar*	Percent Fathers with focational or college training
1. Whites in All-white Senior High Schools	58.1 (32/55)	30.9 (17/55)
2. Whites in All-white Junior High Schools	33.9 (18/53)	16.9 (9/53)
3. Whites in Mixed black Senior High	39.5 (17/43)	20.9 (9/43)
4. Whites in Mixed-black Junior High Schools	27.5 (11/40)	17.5 (7/40)
5. Whites in Mixed-Latin Senior High Schools	25.3 (16/63)	17.4 (11/63)
6. Whites in Mixed-Latin Junior High Schools	19.1 (9/47)	6.3 (3/47)
7. Blacks in All-black Senior High Schools	7.2 (4/55)	7.2 (4/55)
8. Blacks in All-black Junior High Schools	**	**
9. Blacks in Mixed-white Senior High Schools	12.7 (7/55)	10.9 (6/55)
10. Blacks in Mixed-white Junior High Schools	14.2 (2/14)	21.4 (3/14)
11. Latins in Mixed-white Senior High Schools	6.2 (3/48)	2.0 (1/48)
12. Latins in Mixed-white Junior High Schools	7.8 (6/76)	3.9 (3/76)

* Includes professionals, managers, technicians, teachers, nurses, craftsmen, foremen, etc., but excludes clerical and sales, operatives, semi-skilled and unskilled laborers. Also excludes parents whose occupation was unknown to the students.

** Due to time constraints data were not collected at schools in this category. The category is involved here and in the following tables since the author hopes to subsequently collect data at such schools.

Cooperation and Conflict in the Schools

To ascertain the level of conflict between racial and ethnic groups and within such groups, we asked the students a series of questions about good and bad aspects of school contact. The students were asked both general questions about how well the groups got along together as well as specific question about how often certain specific acts had been committed within the past year. The results from each of these types of questions will be reported.

How much conflict is there in the schools? The student reports indicate that there is probably a lot less than we would expect from what we hear and read in the local news media. The question was asked "In general, how do you feel blacks and whites (Anglos and Latins) get along at this school?" The overwhelming majority (67.2%) of the students said they got along "well," "good," or used some other positive description of inter-group relations at their school. An additional 9.8% said that inter-group relations were sometimes good and sometimes bad, but 22.3% said that relations were bad. A few said they really didn't know.

(TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE)

The number (and percentages) of the students in each race-school category who reported good, good and bad, or bad inter-group relations is reported in Table 3. Surprisingly, the students from the one high school in the sample that had received attention in the news media as having racial conflict did not report conflict any more often than did the students at the other schools in the sample. For example, the white students at Washington High (essentially all of category 3, whites in mixed black senior highs) reported conflict only slightly more than the white students at Madison High, category (1)(25.5% vs. 23.6%). Black students in the two schools combined (category 9) reported a similar rate of conflict (23.6%).

TABLE 3

Percentage of students reporting good, bad, and mixed race relations in general in their schools and in their classrooms.

Race-school Category	Race Relations In General: Good	Good and Bad	Bad	Classroom: Good	Good and Bad	Bad	Tot
1. Whites in All-white Senior High Schools	36(65.4%)	4(7.2%)	13(23.6%)	43(78.1%)	1(1.8%)	4(7.2%)	5
2. Whites in All-white Junior High Schools	22(41.5%)	9(16.9%)	18(33.9%)	40(75.4%)	4(7.5%)	1(1.8%)	5
3. Whites in Mixed-black Senior High Schools	27(62.7%)	5(11.6%)	11(25.5%)	33(76.7%)	4(9.3%)	5(11.6%)	4
4. Whites in Mixed-black Junior High Schools	30(95.0%)	4(10.0%)	4(10.0%)	27(67.5%)	4(10.0%)	6(15.0%)	4
5. Whites in Mixed-Latin Senior High Schools	43(68.2%)	9(14.2%)	7(11.1%)	50(79.3%)	9(14.2%)	1(1.5%)	6
6. Whites in Mixed-Latin Junior High Schools	25(53.1%)	4(8.5%)	15(31.9%)	44(93.6%)	2(4.2%)	1(2.1%)	4
7. Blacks in All-black Senior High Schools	**			**			
8. Blacks in All-black Junior High Schools	**			**			
9. Blacks in Mixed-white Senior High Schools	36(65.4%)	5(9.0%)	13(23.6%)	42(76.3%)	6(10.9%)	7(12.7%)	5
10. Blacks in Mixed-white Junior High Schools	13(92.8%)	0(0.02)	1(7.1%)	12(85.7%)	2(14.3%)	0(0.0%)	1
11. Latins in Mixed-white Senior High Schools	39(81.2%)	0	7(14.5%)	36(75.0%)	7(14.5%)	4(8.3%)	4
12. Latins in Mixed-white Junior High Schools	49(64.4%)	7(9.2%)	18(23.6%)	64(84.2%)	1(1.3%)	7(9.2%)	7

* Totals do not add to 100% since students who had no opinion were excluded.

** No whites are enrolled in schools in these categories so the questions were not asked in these schools.

Furthermore, the students in all the schools uniformly reported good inter-group experiences in their classrooms. These results are also reported in Table 3. Except for a few categories approximately three-fourths of the students report only good classroom experiences; this is true of both the black and the white students at Madison and Washington High Schools. An even higher percentage reported good inter-group contacts on classroom projects, so high in fact as to be nearly unanimous. Since the percentage was so high (88.2% in all schools) and since there was little variation between schools, these results are not presented here.

It seems rather clear that the inter-group conflict that does exist occurs primarily outside the classroom-in halls or corridors, on the school grounds or on the way to and from school. These, of course, are areas which are hardest for administrators and teachers to supervise and control, and the students realize this.

Further evidence of the generally good race relations comes from questions we asked the students about teasing in the schools. About half of the students (51.3%) indicated they were kidded or teased, but only 2.0% said it was about race or ethnicity. Furthermore, all the kidding took place primarily within racial or ethnic groups. When asked, only 11.5% indicated that the kidding or teasing was primarily from members of another racial or ethnic groups; 16.0% said the teasing came from both groups; and 25.3% said it was from other members of the same racial or ethnic group. The remaining 46.8% made no distinction or designation of groups, probably indicating their own group was responsible since there was nothing special about it. Of course "teasing" need not be viewed negatively; it often is used to communicate friendship or affect. Teasing could thus be a positive indicator of open and responsive interactions between the students from the different groups.

The minority group students were also asked if they were criticized for

not using standard or formal English as opposed to "Black English or "Spanglish." The majority (63.5%) indicated they were not. Sixteen and two tenths percent indicated that they had been criticized once or twice; 14.5% said it occurred several times, but only 5.8% indicated it occurred often. Again this kind of teasing, kidding, or criticizing was primarily from members of the students' own group (36.5% as compared to 26.2% from whites, 6% from both, and 32.1% who made no racial or ethnic designation). Nevertheless any cross group criticism is likely to affect student attitudes towards each other and intergroup relations. Furthermore, own group "pressure" about racial matters can affect student attitudes and actions towards other racial or ethnic groups. These effects will be discussed in a later section of this paper. Most of the data from Table 3 also indicates that better inter-group relations exist among the junior high school students than among the senior high students. This is even more clear in Table 4 which presents the proportion and percentage of students by racial and ethnic group and by school type

(TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE)

who say they have friends of the other racial or ethnic group. In every comparison of the junior and senior high students, within each type of school and within the various racial groups, a higher proportion of the seventh graders than the tenth graders report having friends of the other major ethnic or racial group in the school (compare Race-School categories 1 and 2, 3 with 4, 5 with 6, etc.) This is an important finding and will be discussed later.

Other important differences appear in Table 4. Some black students even in all black schools indicate that they have white friends (see Category 7).

In fact, only half as many black students in the mixed senior high school (Washington) indicate they have white friends as do black students in

TABLE 4

Proportion of Students Within Each Race-School Category who Report Having Friends of Another Race or Ethnic Group

Race-School Category		
1	Whites in All-white Senior High Schools	7/55 (12.5%)
2	Whites in All-white Junior High Schools	11/53 (20.7%)
3	Whites in Mixed-black Sr. High Schools	12/43 (27.9%)
4	Whites in Mixed-black Jr. High Schools	14/40 (35.0%)
5	Whites in Mixed-Latin Sr. High Schools	24/63 (38.0%)
6	Whites in Mixed-Latin Jr. High Schools	30/47 (63.8%)
7	Blacks in All-black Senior High Schools	12/55 (21.8%)
8	Blacks in All-black Junior High Schools	
9	Blacks in Mixed-white Sr. High Schools	6/55 (10.9%)
10	Blacks in Mixed-white Jr. High Schools	7/14 (50.0%)
11	Latins in Mixed-white Sr. High Schools	20/48 (41.6%)
12	Latins in Mixed-white Jr. High Schools	41/76 (53.9%)

the all black high school (category 9 compared with 7 6/55 compared to 12/55). Either there is more segregation and isolation between the two groups in the mixed school than in the all black school, or else the black students refuse for social reasons to admit that they have white friends. Sampling problems (i.e., small N's) prevent similar comparisons for the black junior high school students. For white students, however, a larger proportion at both the mixed senior and junior high schools indicate they have black friends than white students at the basically all-white schools (compare category 3 with 1 and 4 with 2). Thus, a tentative conclusion is that mixed black and white schools seem to increase white acceptance of black students since they have greater exposure to blacks and more opportunities to form friendships. However, black students in the same mixed schools appear to be more isolated from the whites than blacks in all black schools, at least at the senior high level.

The same kinds of comparisons cannot be made for Latin-white schools since there are no all-Latin schools in the city. However, white-Latin or Anglo-Latin relationships appear to be better than black-white relationships. A significantly higher percentage (38.0%) of the tenth grade whites in the mixed Latin schools indicated they have friends of another ethnic group than any other group of tenth grade students interviewed, except the Latin students in the same school (41.6%). The same conclusion can be drawn from the figures for the seventh grades except that more whites than Latins say they have friends from the other group (63.8% for whites compared to 53.7% for Latins). This is somewhat surprising since these figures include the students from Kosciuszko Junior High which experienced some intergroup conflict only one week prior to our interviews at the school. However, the data indicate that the conflict did harm our interviews at the school. The students in categories 6 and 12 which included the students at Kosciuszko indicated that classroom

relations with students of other ethnic groups were good (93.6% and 84.2%) which was the highest reported in any of the race-school categories (see Table 3). But the same students indicated that general intergroup relations were not good (53.1% and 64.4% which was below the figures reported by students in several other categories). Although the news media focused heavily on the conflict, classroom relations and cross ethnic friendships at the school apparently remained good compared to the other schools. It was only on the general level that students at the school reported worse intergroup relations.

The better intergroup relations among the Anglos and Latins compared to blacks and whites probably reflects two factors. First, attitudinal research has repeatedly shown that prejudice is directly related to color, and more anti-black feeling exists than anti-Latin. Secondly, Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans who constitute the bulk of the Latin community are a much smaller minority than the black community. Again, sociological attitudinal research has repeatedly shown that less prejudice is displayed towards small minorities than towards larger ones.

One final interesting aspect of the results presented thus far is that contrary to intuitive expectations, the opportunity for good intergroup relations seems to exist in the schools that are located in lower rather than higher socio-economic areas. The students in the schools with the lowest scores on the socio-economic indices (as reported in Table 2) reported more frequently than students in other schools that they had friends of the other group. This probably results from residential patterns. Obviously the students in the basically all-white schools had few opportunities to participate in inter-racial friendships even though they indicated as often as students of the other schools that intergroup relations were good at their school (see Table 3). The students in the racially mixed areas , on the other

hand, where the socio-economic status of the parents was lower, would have ample opportunities to form intergroup friendship.

Before making any final assessment of the condition of race relations in the schools investigated, let us examine some of the specific complaints about race relations in the schools; e.g. the frequency of fighting, stealing and threatening that occurs in the schools.

The frequency of beatings or fights at the senior high level appears to be quite consistent at all the high schools included in the sample and consistent for all the racial and ethnic groups (see Table 5).

(TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE)

Between 25.5% and 29.0% of the students at most of the high schools reported hearing of beatings (or fights) "often" or "all the time". The primary exception was South Division High School where only 19.0% of the whites and 22.9% of the Latins reported fights often or all the time. Blacks at racially mixed high schools also reported fights or beatings slightly more frequently (36.3%). At the junior high school level, the frequency was much higher, but again rather consistent across schools. At the seventh grade level the percentage of students who reported frequent fighting ranged from 35.7% for black students in mixed schools to 55.3% for whites in mixed-Latin schools. However, at the rest of the schools the percentage ranged from 43.3% to 47.5%. The data reflect the fact that fighting is much more a junior high than a senior high phenomenon.

Despite the moderate level of fighting, 57.4% of all the students indicated that they had never known one of their friends to get beaten up, and only 11.2% said that it had happened more than once to their friends. Furthermore, 83.7% said they, themselves, had never been beaten at school, and 84.0% said they were generally not afraid they would be beaten. Fighting is a

TABLE 5

Proportion of Students in each Race-School Classification who reported hearing of students getting beaten up "often" or "all the time" and proportion who blamed various groups

Race-School Category	Proportion Reporting Frequent Fights	Primary Groups Blamed: Gangs or Greasers	Minorities	Whites	Minorities and Whites
1. Whites in All-White Senior High Schools	15/55(27.2%)	11/55			
2. Whites in All-White Junior High Schools	23/53(43.3%)	20/53			
3. Whites in Mixed-black Senior High Schools	11/43(25.5%)		23/43	0/43	6/43
4. Whites in Mixed-black Junior High Schools	19/40(47.5%)		12/40	8/40	8/40
5. Whites in Mixed-latin Senior High Schools	12/63(19.0%)		13/63	7/63	15/63
6. Whites in Mixed-Latin Junior High Schools	26/47(55.3%)		7/47	1/47	15/47
7. Blacks in All-black Senior High Schools	16/55(29.0%)	9/55			
8. Blacks in All-black Junior High Schools					
9. Blacks in Mixed-white Senior High Schools	20/55(36.3%)		27/55	1/55	10/55
10. Blacks in Mixed-white Junior High Schools	5/14 (35.7%)		4/14	1/14	3/14
11. Latins in Mixed-white Senior High Schools	11/48(22.9%)		14/48	2/48	11/48
12. Latins in Mixed-white Junior High Schools	34/76(44.7%)		17/76	1/76	25/76

relatively frequent phenomenon in the teenage years and is one way in which some youth work out their identity. This is indicated by the fact that 27.1% say they have beaten up someone else, but 73.3% of them indicate the other person was a friend. In any case, the problem resolves itself for most of the youth before their high school years.

At a number of the schools gangs or "greasers" were blamed for the fights. This was particularly true at the all-black and basically all-white schools. There were also large numbers of students at most schools who blamed members of their own group for fights or who blamed members of both groups. At the racially or ethnically mixed schools, however, blacks or Latins were disproportionately blamed, even by members of the minority groups themselves. This was particularly true at the mixed black-white senior high level (see categories 3 and 9). This occurs despite the fact that fighting is a junior high more than a senior high phenomonon and occurs even though the black and white students' perception of the frequency of fighting is no higher at the racially mixed schools that at the all black and all white schools.

These perceptions are further supported by the fact that blacks in the senior high mixed school reported beating up someone else more often (38.2%) than any other race-school category on the senior high level. Fifty percent of the black students in the mixed junior highs reported beating up someone. However, the sample in this latter category (10) is extremely small, and the percentages are not very reliable for that category. Nevertheless, whites in the mixed junior high report a similar rate (47.5%). At the senior high level, however, the whites in the mixed school had the lowest rate of any of the categories (see Table 6, category 3, 9.3%). Latins and whites at the senior high level had a very low rate of fights (12.5% and 11.1% respectively), while the junior high Latin and white students reported an intermediate rate of being beaten up.

TABLE 6

Proportion of students in each Race-School classification who reported they had beaten up someone or who had been beaten up by someone else.

Race-School Category	Proportion Who Beat Up Someone else	Proportion Beat Up by Someone	Assailant: Same Racial or Ethnic Grp.	Assailant: Other Racial or Ethnic Grp.	Assailant: Both	Assailant: Not Ascertained
1. Whites in All-white Senior High Schools	11/55(20.0%)	9/55(16.4%)	3	5	1	0
2. Whites in All-white Junior High Schools	12/53(22.7%)	9/53(17.0%)	7	1	1	0
3. Whites in Mixed-black Senior High Schools	4/43(9.3%)	7/43(16.3%)	0	6	0	1
4. Whites in Mixed-black Junior High Schools	19/40(47.5%)	14/40(35.0%)	2	8	1	3
5. Whites in Mixed-Latin Senior High Schools	7/63(11.1%)	9/63(14.3%)	4	4	0	1
6. Whites in Mixed-Latin Junior High Schools	14/47(29.8%)	10/47(21.2%)	3	4	0	3
7. Blacks in All-Black Senior High Schools	17/55(31.0%)	3/52(5.8%)	*	*	*	*
8. Blacks in All-Black Junior High Schools	14/39(36.0%)	5/39(12.8%)	*	*	*	*
9. Blacks in Mixed-white Senior High Schools	21/55(38.2%)	5/55(9.1%)	4	0	0	1
10. Blacks in Mixed-white Junior High Schools	7/14(50.0%)	4/14(28.6%)	2	1	0	1
11. Latins in Mixed-white Senior High Schools	6/48(12.5%)	4/48(8.3%)	2	1	0	1
12. Latins in Mixed-white Junior High Schools	21/76(27.6%)	9/76(11.8%)	3	5	0	1

* All black schools

The high rates for the black students in the mixed black-white senior high school may exist for several reasons. First, the high rate for the black students in the mixed white senior high school may reflect a "be tough" stance vis-a-vis the white students, when in fact the rates may actually be much lower. Second, they may feel a need to establish and maintain their identity as a minority student in a racially mixed school. Thirdly, fighting and threatening other students tends to be a lower-class phenomenon more than a middle-class phenomenon, and several of the differences in rates can be explained in part by the differences in the social class compositions of the various schools. Recall that fewer blacks than whites in the racially mixed schools reported that their parents had middle class jobs or post high school educational or vocational training. The differences between the rates of fighting in the all-black and basically all-white schools can be explained in a similar manner.

Evidence of the "be tough" interpretation is also given by the low number of students especially the black students in the same schools who reported someone had beaten them up. An attempt to maintain self-esteem and dignity by being tough would operate twice here. The number who say they have beaten someone else up would be exaggerated while the number who say they have never been beaten up would be under-reported. Only 9.1% of the black seniors at the mixed school reported being beaten up (see Table 6). This was lower than any other race-school category except the all-black senior high and the Latins in the mixed-while-Latin senior high where few fights occurred.

Given the relatively low proportion of students who have friends of other racial or ethnic groups and given that most who fought did so with friends (73.3%), it is somewhat surprising that many cross racial fights occurred. Nevertheless, several were reported, and disproportionately it was the white students who reported being beaten up by the minority students. These figures are also reported in Table 6. Twenty-eight of the 58 white students who reported being beaten up said the assailant was a minority student. In 8 cases race was not ascertained, and in 19 cases whites were beaten up by white assailants. On the other hand, only 7 of the 22 minority students in mixed schools reported that the assailant was white while 11 reported that the assailant was from their own group. In an additional four cases the race or ethnicity of the assailant was not ascertained.

Again, the differences in social class and cultural expectations explain in part the differences reported here. There also appears to be a lot of "posturing" behavior by some minority students who, either through fights or bluffs and threats, feel the need to prove themselves or "be tough" to other students.

Similar results and interpretations apply to the data on threats and stealing. The tables presenting these data will be presented here, but only differences from the previous conclusions and discussion regarding fighting will be discussed. The proportion of students who reported frequently hearing of thefts or threats is reported in Table 7. The lowest reported incidence of theft at the high school level was in the Latin-white high school, while the lowest rate at the junior high level was at the basically all-white school. On the senior high level the students in racially mixed schools actually reported lower rates of theft than in either the all-black or basically all-white high schools. Again the overall rates were generally higher in the junior high schools than in the senior high schools.

TABLE 7

Proportion of students in each Race-School classification who reported stealing and threats occuring often or all the time.

Race-School Category	Proportion Heard of Stealing	Proportion Heard of Threats	Primary Groups Blamed for Threats			
			Gangs or Greasers	Minorities	Whites	Minor. and Whites
1.Whites in All-white Senior High Schools	30/55(54.5%)	5/55(9.0%)	8/55	4/55	4/55	4/55
2.Whites in All-white Junior High Schools	17/53(32.0%)	18/53(33.9%)	11/53	10/53	3/53	10/53
3.Whites in Mixed-black Senior High Schools	20/43(46.5%)	15/43(34.8%)	-	15/43	0/43	11/43
4.Whites in Mixed-black Junior High Schools	26/40(65.0%)	14/40(35.0%)	-	9/40	2/40	14/40
5.Whites in Mixed-Latin Senior High Schools	21/63(33.3%)	20/63(31.7%)	-	3/63	1/63	13/63
6.Whites in Mixed-Latin Junior High Schools	21/47(44.6%)	12/47(25.5%)	-	13/47	0/47	10/47
7.Blacks in All-black Senior High Schools	28/55(50.9%)	12/55(21.8%)	-	*	*	*
8.Black in All-black Junior High Schools	23/39(58.9%)	18/39(46.1%)	-	*	*	*
9.Blacks in Mixed-white Senior High Schools	29/55(52.7%)	22/55(40.0%)	--	14/55	1/55	16/55
10.Blacks in Mixed-white Junior High Schools	8/14(57.1%)	6/14(42.8%)	-	1/14	1/14	4/14
11.Latins in Mixed-white Senior High Schools	14/48(29.1%)	14/48(29.1%)	-	8/48	6/48	6/48
12.Latins in Mixed-white Junior High Schools	35/76(46.0%)	24/76(31.5%)	-	10/76	0/76	18/76

* all black schools.

(TABLE 7 ABOUT HERE)

Of course it is almost impossible to know who is responsible for most theft. Yet only 53.5% did not specify a particular group when asked who was responsible in their school. Eleven point two percent said everybody did it. The remainder blamed particular groups of people, and disproportionately the minority students were blamed more often than the white students. Nevertheless, half (53.5%) said they personally had never had anything stolen; 23.8% said they had personal belongings stolen once; and 22.6% said they had belongings stolen more than once.

The results obtained from the more specific questions on personal threats were similar to the data on fights (see Table 8).

(TABLE 8 ABOUT HERE)

In general the students in the schools where few fights occurred reported low rates of personal threats;and the schools in which students frequently reported fights had high rates of threats. The only exceptions were the black students in the mixed schools. They reported a much higher rate of threats than fights. Again this probably reflects the "posture" the students take. It is acceptable to admit being threatened or to admit beating up someone, but for a student to admit that someone else beat him up is demeaning and injurious to one's self-esteem.

Also, similar to the data on fights, the minority students are disproportionately blamed for the threats although this is not consistent for all the schools. Of the 86 white students who said they had been personally threatened, 35 said it was by minority students, 27 said it was by other white students, and 4 said it was by both minority and white students. In 20 cases race was not specified or ascertained. Of the 62 minority students who had

TABLE 8

Proportion of students in each Race-School classification who reported being personally threatened by other students.

Race-School Category	Proportion Personally Threatened	Threatened by Member of			
		Same Racial or Ethnic Grp.	Other Racial or Ethnic Grp.	Both	Not Ascertained
1. Whites in All-white Senior High Schools	13/55(23.6%)	6	0	0	7
2. Whites in All-white Junior High Schools	16/53(30.2%)	6	7	0	3
3. Whites in Mixed-black Senior High Schools	14/43(32.6%)	2	9	0	3
4. Whites in Mixed-black Junior High Schools	23/40(57.6%)	5	7	2	3
5. Whites in Mixed-Latin Senior High Schools	11/63(17.5%)	5	2	1	3
6. Whites in Mixed-Latin Junior High Schools	32/47(68.0%)	3	10	1	1
7. Blacks in All-black Senior High Schools	8/55(14.5%)	*	*	*	*
8. Blacks in All-black Junior High Schools	10/39(25.6%)	*	*	*	*
9. Blacks in Mixed-white Senior High Schools	17/55(30.9%)	15	1	0	1
10. Blacks in Mixed-white Junior High Schools	5/14(35.7%)	2	1	2	0
11. Latins in Mixed-white Senior High Schools	17/48(35.4%)	10	1	1	5
12. Latins in Mixed-white Junior High Schools	23/76(30.3%)	12	4	1	6

* all black schools.

been personally threatened, 39 said it was by someone of their own racial or ethnic group; only 7 said it was by whites, and 4 said it was by both groups, In 12 cases race or ethnicity was not ascertained. One problem with these data is that students probably remember fights or threats with members of other racial or ethnic groups more than they do fights and threats from students of their own group.

In sum, some students, minority students more than white students and black students more than Latin students, feel compelled to prove themselves in physical ways in the mixed schools. They do this by fighting, bullying, and threatening both minority and white students. These are part of the maturational processes for a number of youth. The problem occurs more frequently at the junior high school level than at the senior high level and seemingly runs its course by the time the students are in high school. The conflict is further reduced when significant numbers of the trouble-makers either quit or are pushed out of the schools by the time they reach high school.

This does not necessarily mean the schools have bad race relations. When maturational problems are worked out in racially and ethnicly mixed schools that have groups of significantly different social class origins, and orientations and skills, the conflict that occurs naturally is bound to pick up some intergroup tones.

Summary

In summary the following conclusions can be drawn from the data presented thus far:

(1) Better intergroup relations (in terms of acceptance and intergroup friendships) appear to occur in the junior high schools than in the senior high schools. This is true despite the higher rates of reported fights, thefts and threats at the junior high level.

(2) Better relations appear to exist in the Latin-white schools than in the black-white schools.

(3) Integrated educational experiences appear to increase the tolerance of the white students for black students, but not necessarily the tolerance of the black students for the white students (at least on the senior high school level).

(4) Because of the housing patterns there are more opportunities for working and lower middle-class whites than for upper-middle-class whites to have exposure to the minority students. The opposite is probably true for the black students.

(5) The minority populations are blamed more often than the white population by both the white and the minority students for any fights, threats and even thefts that occur in the schools, even though the actual thieves are seldom known. This finding was interpreted in terms of the differences in social class of the different populations, and in terms of a "be tough" posture on the part of the minority students.

Overall the level of intergroup friendships appear to be relatively low for schools in which groups mix daily. If anything, the figures on inter-racial friendship are inflated since some students probably gave "socially desirable" answers, some, no doubt, indicated they had friends of the other group when in fact they did not. Furthermore, the question asked only whether they had friends from the other group, not whether they were good friends. And finally, the data on inter-racial conflict show that a substantial proportion of the students have some experience in "bad" intergroup relations.

Nevertheless, the data at the same time indicate that a great deal of good intergroup relations exist in the schools. Furthermore, a great deal of the conflict that does occur is probably not racial in origin. The schools are

often blamed for not solving the problems of society when in fact they only reflect the problems of the larger society. This is the case here. Much of the conflict that appears in the schools mirrors the pervasive concern in Milwaukee with intergroup relations. We asked the students how their parents felt about integration. Frequently the students made a distinction between parental attitudes and their own, but often the student attitudes coincided quite closely with their parents' attitudes.

However, the central thrust of this research is not to show bad or good race relations in one school or another or in the Milwaukee schools in general. Rather the primary concern is the effects that various school experience, especially the intergroup experiences, have on student attitudes and eventually their performance in schools. It is this topic to which we now turn.

Correlates of Intergroup Polarization

For over two decades now social scientists have conducted research which generally supported the "contact hypothesis," i.e. equal-status contact reduces racial prejudice, stereotypes and discrimination. Of course, the contact must occur under good conditions, ideally in the pursuit of common goals. The reduction of prejudice is also facilitated by institutional support and sanction, and by perception of common interests (see Gordon Allport, The Nature of Prejudice. 1954, p. 267). These ideal conditions are seldom met, but the body of research supporting this hypothesis is impressive. Improved race relations have been found in a wide variety of settings: the military service, housing projects, among department store clerks, in gangs, and of course in educational settings.

Recently, however, Armor (David Armor, The Public Interest, Summer, 1972) reported that support for black power, black power ideology, and desire for

predominantly black schools increased among integrated (bused) students more than among control (non-bused) black students. Thus, one of the primary concerns of this research is to assess the effects that integrated versus segregated school experiences have on the intergroup attitudes of the students in the Milwaukee schools. The findings reported here are not directly comparable to those of Armor for several reasons. There are time and location differences; he examined Boston students from 1968 to 1970. The black power movement and black separatist ideology were much more salient and popular than they are now. Secondly, he examined several different groups of students over the three points in time; in this study we are attempting to follow the same students over three points in time. Thus, the data reported here are preliminary only and, firm conclusions will have to await collection of subsequent data so that changes in the student orientations can be examined. Finally, the integrated students surveyed by Armor were bused students and involved students undergoing racial integration. Although the racial composition of most of the schools in the Milwaukee sample is changing, the schools are nevertheless much more stable than the schools that Armor examined.

Measures of both support for integration (versus separation) by both minority and white students, and measures of awareness by the students of minority community activities and leaders were obtained. The data on awareness will be reported first. We asked both the white students and the minority students if they had heard of a list of black and Latin groups and individuals. The list of blacks was read to all students in all schools except the schools where there were large percentages of Latin students. In the latter schools a Latin list was read to both the white and minority students. The two lists were:

Black organizations and indivuals	Latin organizations and individuals
NAACP (National Assoc. for Advancement of Colored People)	Young Lords
Martin Luther King	Reies Tijerina
Jessie Jackson	MAYO (Mexican-American Youth Organization)
Malcolm X	Cesar Chavez
Black P-Store Nation	El Movimiento Estudiantil Chicanos de Atzlan (MECHA)
Black Muslims	Brown Berets
Shirley Chisholm	UMOS (United Migrant Opportunity Services)
Republic of New Africa	Corky Gonzalez
Commandos	
Enforcers	

In both cases an attempt was made to include both national and local groups and to include both integrationist and separatist organizations. It was much more difficult, however, to construct the Latin list since Latin leaders receive relatively little publicity in this part of the country, and since nationally they are a relatively small group. This lack of publicity is reflected in the lesser awareness of both the white and the Latin students about the Latin groups and individuals (than of the black groups and individuals). The Latin list also included only eight groups and individuals while the black list included ten. If the students indicated that they had heard of the group or individual they were asked if they agreed or disagreed with the individual, or groups' philosophy. The agreement-disagreement data will not be reported here, however. The proportions of the students recognizing four (in the case of the black organizations and individuals) and three (in the case of Latin organizations and individuals) are presented in Table 9.

(TABLE 9 ABOUT HERE)

TABLE 9

Proportion of Students in each Race-school Category who Recognized half of a List of Minority Organizations and Individuals*

Race-School Category	Proportion
1. Whites in All-white Senior High Schools	17/55 (30.9%)
2. Whites in All-white Junior High Schools	12/53 (22.6%)
3. Whites in Mixed-black Senior High Schools	21/43 (48.8%)
4. Whites in Mixed-Black Junior High Schools	12/40 (30.0%)
5. Whites in Mixed-Latin Senior High Schools	7/63 (11.1%)
6. Whites in Mixed-Latin Junior High Schools	1/47 (2.1%)
7. Blacks in All-Black Senior High Schools	54/55 (98.1%)
8. Blacks in All-Black Junior High Schools	
9. Blacks in Mixed-White Senior High Schools	51/55 (92.7%)
10. Blacks in Mixed-White Junior High Schools	9/14 (64.2%)
11. Latins in Mixed-White Senior High Schools	12/48 (25.0%)
12. Latins in Mixed-White Junior High Schools	3/76 (3.9%)

* For list see text.

The percentages reported are probably inflated since students would attempt to appear knowledgeable and thus would likely indicate that they had heard of more than they actually had. This may have been particularly true of the minority students who realized that the list contained only minority groups or individuals. Nevertheless, the follow-up question on agreement-disagreement with the philosophy of the group or individual and the fact that we could have asked them to identify the group or individual would have decreased this tendency.

As would be expected, the high school students recognized the names on the list much more often than the junior high students. Whites in the mixed-black schools also recognized the names more often than whites in the basically all-white schools, and this was true at both the junior and senior high level. Surprisingly, a higher percentage of the blacks in the all-black schools recognized the names than the black students in the racially mixed schools. These latter differences are rather small or are based on small numbers and are probably not statistically significant, however. Further examination of the data revealed that 33 of the 55 black senior high school students in all black schools recognized nine or more on the list while only 11 of the 55 black senior high students in the racially mixed schools identified nine or more. However, the two local groups, Enforcers and Commandos, were very local groups, indeed almost neighborhood groups and the location of the schools probably had a significant effect on recognition of these two groups.

Both the Latin and the black students were much more aware of the names than were the white students in the same schools. As indicated earlier, the Latin organizations and individuals receive much less national media attention and thus are less well-known to both the Latin and the white students than the organizations and individuals on the black list.

It is reassuring to find that significant proportions of the white students are aware of the minority groups. Nevertheless, the results can be deceiving. Nearly all the students, both black and white, recognized Martin Luther King. However, a surprising 39 of the 98 white senior high school students failed to recognize the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), and 59 did not recognize the name of Malcolm X, whose influence remains strong today. Among the Latin names Cesar Chavez is the best known figure, but his name was not recognized by 39 of the 63 white seniors (who were asked the Latin list) and 12 of the 48 Latins in senior high school failed to recognize his name. United Migrant Opportunity Services (U.M.O.S.) which has been very active in the local community was actually recognized by more of the Latin students on both the junior and senior level than any other individual or organization including Cesar Chevez. Thirty-nine of the 48 Latin senior high students and 44 of 76 Latin junior high school students recognized his name. Considering that the figures are probably somewhat inflated due to some "socially desirable" answers, it appears that the students' awareness of popular political leaders and organizations in the minority communities could be improved.

Furthermore, awareness is not knowledge, or understanding, or agreement and support for minority points of view. Table 10 presents some data that bear indirectly on the attitudes and feelings of the groups towards each other.

(TABLE 10 ABOUT HERE)

The students were asked, in general, whether they would favor integration or separatism. They were then further asked if they preferred to be in a school that was composed of all minority students, mostly minority students, half

TABLE 10

Proportion of Students in each Race-school Category who prefer school with students mostly or all of the same race, and proportion who favor Integration and Separatism in general.

Race-school Category	Total	Proportion Prefer Mostly or all Same race in School	Proportion Like to See		
			Integration	Separatism	Not Sure or Doesn't Matter
1.Whites in All-white Senior High Schools	55	30 (54.5%)	36(65.4%)	9(16.3%)	10(18.1%)
2.Whites in All-white Junior High Schools	53	21 (39.6%)	35(66.0%)	9(16.9%)	9(16.9%)
3.Whites in Mixed-black Senior High	43	8 (18.6%)	33(76.7%)	7(16.2%)	3(6.9%)
4.Whites in Mixed-black Junior High	40	17 (42.5%)	28(70.0%)	8(20.0%)	4(10.0%)
5.Whites in Mixed-Latin Sr. High	63	8 (12.6%)	52(82.5%)	9(14.2%)	2(3.1%)
6.Whites in Mixed-Latin Jr. High	47	8 (17.0%)	40(85.1%)	6(12.7%)	1(2.1%)
7.Blacks in All-black Senior High Schools	55	15 (27.2%)	31(56.3%)	23(41.8%)	1(1.3%)
8.Blacks in All-black Junior High Schools					
9.Blacks in Mixed-white Sr. High	55	14 (25.4%)	37(67.2%)	10(18.1%)	8(14.5%)
10.Blacks in Mixed-white Jr. High	14	1 (7.1%)	11(78.5%)	3(21.4%)	0(0.0%)
11.Latins in Mixed-white Senior High	48	3 (6.2%)	41(85.4%)	3(6.2%)	4(8.3%)
12.Latins in Mixed-white Junior High	76	7 (9.2%)	62(81.5%)	7(9.2%)	7(9.2%)

minority-half white, mostly white, or all white.

Among both the white and the Latin students, on both the senior and the junior high levels, there was strong support for integration. This was shown on both measures. The overwhelming majority of both the groups supported integration and very few expressed a preference for schools that were composed of mostly or all the same group of students. This is consistent with previous results reported in this paper, that relatively good intergroup relations prevailed in the Latin-white schools.

Among the white students there was consistent strong support for integration at both the senior and junior high levels and by white students in both the racially mixed and the basically all-white schools. Two-thirds or more of the students in all the schools supported the general idea of integration. Less than 20% or less than one in five supported separatism. Yet in response to the more specific question about the kind of school composition they would prefer large numbers said they would prefer a school composed of mostly or all whites. Whites in the two junior high school categories (2 and 4) expressed nearly the same preference for a dominantly white school (39.6% and 42.5%). But on the senior high school level 54.5% of the white students in the basically all-white school preferred a predominently white school while only 18.6% the students in the racially-mixed senior high school category expressed that preference (compare category 1 with 3).

Among the black senior high students there was no substantial difference in the proportion in the all-black and those in the mixed-white schools who preferred a mostly black school (27.2% versus 25.4%). However, a smaller proportion of the students from the all-black schools supported integration and a much larger proportion supported separatism than did the students in the mixed-white senior high schools (41.8% compared to 18.1%). This last finding contradicts

the conclusion of the Armor study in Boston. He had found the integrated (bused) students supported black separatism more than those who were still in the segregated schools. Although the student populations are not exactly comparable, we have found the opposite. And though Armor did not present data on the white students' attitudes, we have found that, at least at the senior high level, the white students in the integrated schools have much more tolerance and acceptance of the minority students than white students in basically all-white schools. This was true in both the black-white and Latin-white schools.

Finally, the white support for integration in general was slightly stronger than black support for integration. Although this difference is quite small and probably not statistically significant, the difference runs counter to what is normally assumed, that blacks want integration more than whites. Perhaps members of the younger generation of blacks are not as desirous of integration as their elders, or they may be more honest than their elders in expressing their preference for separatism. The results may also indicate more recent disaffection with integration as a solution to racial problems in the U.S.

The same conclusion, however, cannot be drawn from the other measure included in the table. A much larger proportion of the white students than the black students expressed a preference for a school composed of mostly or all the same race of students. The only exceptions to this were the white students in the mixed-black senior high school who expressed very little preference for same race schools. Thus, even though the black students supported integration in general slightly less than the whites, they still valued and supported integrated education.

Analyses of additional data point to differences in the importance or saliency of racial separatism (versus integrationism) for the three student populations: blacks, whites, and Latins. These analyses also provide an interpretation for some of the results just presented.

A large portion of the self-administered questionnaire was devoted to attitudinal questions about segregated versus integrated education. For example, the students were asked to indicate whether and how strongly they agreed or disagreed with the following statements: (1) People learn things in general more quickly from people of the same race; (2) Most of my classroom experiences with students of another race (ethnic group) have been enjoyable; (3) Close friendship between blacks and whites (Latins and whites) is possible. In all, thirteen different questions were asked.

The responses were subjected to a statistical procedure called factor analysis which essentially shows the relationships and clusterings among the items. Factor analysis essentially creates a new variable called a factor- the reason for the name of the procedure, but sometimes called a dimension. The procedure derives the one best description of the inter-relationship betwee.. all of the items or variables.

Two general types of items had been included in this part of the questionnaire: (1) items which showed support for racial separatism versus integration, and (2) items which would reflect an avoidance orientation towards members of the other group. The factor analysis revealed that these two factor grouping did exist and that they tended to be separate and distinct "response tendencies." For discussion purposes these two dimensions are labeled (1) integration-separatism dimension (2) avoidance-approach. The integration-separatism dimension appears to tap ideological or political attitudes, while the avoidence-approach dimension appears to tap a personal action orientation.

When all thirteen items were included in the analysis, the new dimension explained or accounted for varying percentages of the original items depending on which group was being examined. These results are reported in Table 11. For the white students asked about blacks the avoidance-approach dimension accounted for 32.6% of the variance in the original items. This was higher than for any of the other groups including whites asked about Latins (28.4%). In general, the higher the percentage the more salient that dimension is for that group of students. Thus the avoidance-approach dimension was the most important for whites, especially with regard to blacks, next most important for the Latin students(24.3%)and the least important for the black students(19.6%). The integration-separatism dimension explained much less variance (in the original items) than the avoidence-approach dimension for all groups except the black students for whom it was more important than the avoidance approach dimension.

(TABLE 11 ABOUT HERE)

A third dimension appeared for each of the groups, but was less important statistically and substantively than either of the first two. For the whites this dimension is best described as intergroup friendship and reflected the students' beliefs that such friendships were or were not possible. The third dimension for both the Latin and the black students that emerged was one that dealt with racial or ethnic pride. These facotrs are also presented in Table 11.

The race-school categories were examined for differences on the two dimensions. Further differences between the three groups could not be examined since different items were used to compute the indices for each of

TABLE 12

Explained Variance of Factor Analysis: Attitudes of Four Different Groups about Intergroup Relations.

Factors	Whites asked about Blacks	Whites asked about Latins	Blacks asked about Whites	Latins asked about Whites
Avoidance-Approach	32.6%	28.4%	19.6%	24.3%
Integration-Separatism	13.9%	10.8%	22.7%	10.0%
Intergroup Friendship	7.8%	8.7%	-	-
Group Pride	-	-	9.3%	9.3%

the populations. The Latin junior high school students scored slightly higher on the avoidance measure than the Latin senior high students, but the difference was not statistically significant ($F=2.92$, d.f.=122, $p<.086$) and there was no difference on the separatism-integration dimension. However, both the junior and senior high white students in the basically all-white schools and the white junior high school students in the mixed-black schools scored on the avoidance end of the avoidance-approach dimension. The white senior high students in the mixed-black school and whites in both the Junior and Senior High mixed-Latin schools scored on the approach end of the dimension ($F=2.42$, d.f.=295, $p<.05$). These differences were significant at the .05 level which means that differences this large would have occurred by chance only 5 out of every 100 times. The avoidence-approach dimension was very much a personality dimension and related well with a whole variety of personality measures that were included in the questionnaire. But, it is clear that school experience of the students also affected the likelihood that students would approach or avoid members of other groups. On the other, more ideological dimension, the differences were similar, although they did not follow exactly the same pattern, but they were not statistically significant ($F=2.10$ d.f.=295, $p<.065$). That these latter differences were not as strong probably reflects the fact that this dimension was less salient for the white students than the avoidance-approach dimension. Thus the results for the white students indicate that resistence or support for integration is more a personality and personal response than an ideological response.

This conclusion is supported by the correlations of both dimensions with several of the other variables measured in this study. The correlations for

all three populations, the whites, blacks, and Latins are smaller for the separatism-integration dimension than for the avoidance-approach dimension. This was true for measures of demographic background variables, academic performance, parental and peer influences, school experiences and personality variables. (See Table 12). These correlations will be discussed in a moment.

(TABLE 12 ABOUT HERE)

For the black students significant differences appeared on both dimensions. Recall that black students in the all-black senior high school preferred a predominantly black school much more often than the black students in the integrated schools. This was the opposite of what Armor found in Boston. The data on the avoidance-approach dimension supported this; the black students in all-black schools scored highly on the avoidance end of the avoidance-approach dimension. The black students in the mixed-white senior high school and the black students in the mixed-white junior high schools scored highly on the approach end of the measure. These differences were statistically significant at the .001 level ($F=30.3$, d.f.$=159$, $p < .001$) and would occur by chance only once in every 1,000 times.

However, the results on the separatism-integration dimension were just the opposite. The students in the integrated schools showed ideological support for separatism while the students in the all-black senior high school showed support for integration. These results were also statistically significant at the .001 level ($F= 7.34$, d.f.$=159$) Thus the black students in the integrated senior high, because of their experience in the integrated schools, felt they could approach their white classmates. But for ideological reasons which also appear to be school based, they maintained more of a separatist orientation than the blacks in the all-black schools. The Armor findings in

Table 12

Selected Correlates of the Integration - Separatism and Avoidance - Approach Dimensions

Integration (vs. Separatism)

	Demographic Variable	Academic Variables				Parental and Peer Influences		
	Father's Occupation	Academic Capability	Educational Aspirations	Grades	English Usage	Cross-Group Friends	Friends Prefer Integ.	Parents Prefer Integ.
Black	-.025	.027	.019	.321**	-.050	.137*	.153*	.158*
White	.025	.161**	.186**	.210**	.179**	.126**	.100*	.074
Latin	-.174*	.124	.074	.196**	-.055	.062	.089	.042

	School Experiences		Personality Variables					Feelings (Attitude)	
	Good Intergroup Relations	Good Classroom Experiences	Sense of Control	Debilitating Anxiety	Facilitating Anxiety	Anomie	Self Concept	About Police	About Teachers
Black	-.125***	-.174***	.178**	-.260**	-.192**	.191**	.330**	.160**	.113
White	-.150**	-.152**	.048	.032	.114*	-.109**	.018	.201**	-.047
Latin	-.131	-.080	.164*	-.137	-.070	.034	.085	.108	.197**

Approach (vs. Avoidance)

	Demographic Variable	Academic Variables				Parental and Peer Influences		
	Father's Occupation	Academic Capability	Educational Aspirations	Grades	English Usage	Cross-Group Friends	Friends Pref Integ.	Parents Prefer Integ.
Black	-.174**	.067	.043	.183**	.412**	.062	.052	.128*
White	.195**	.273**	.066	.205**	.138**	.234**	.157**	.173**
Latin	.072	.106	.222**	.171*	.200**	.149*	.201**	.277**

	School Experiences		Personality Variables					Feelings (Attitude)	
	Good Inter-Group Relations	Good Classroom Experiences	Sense of Control	Debilitating Anxiety	Facilitating Anxiety	Anomie	Self Concept	About Police	About Teachers
Black	.446***	.377***	.226**	.089	-.275**	.067	.195**	.078	.554**
White	.210**	.000	.321**	-.095*	-.166**	.133**	.317**	-.012	.362**
Latin	.065	.079	.522**	-.234**	-.361**	.194*	.464**	.264**	.254**

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ ***asked only of blacks in integrated schools

NOTE: Significance levels vary by population because of unequal N's.

Boston may reflect this ideological orientation more than the personal experience orientation. In any case, the distinction between these two dimensions needs to be maintained for any continuing research on the origins of support for racial integration or separatism and for continuing research on the effects of integrated versus segregated school experiences on student attitudes.

Table 12 reports the association or correlation of selected variables with both the separatism-integration and the avoidance-approach dimensions. These correlations are pearsonian or cross-product correlations and can range from -1.00 which would be a perfect inverse correlation to 0.00 which would mean there is no association whatsoever, to +1.00 which would be a perfect direct relationship. Asterisks have been placed by those correlations which are large enough that they would not have occurred by chance alone. The inclusion of these other variables allows us to examine the correlates of integration versus separatism and of the avoidance versus approach orientation of the students. The groups or blocks of variables that will be examined are demographic variables, academic variables, parental and peer influences, school experiences, personality variables and two attitudinal variables: student feelings about the police and feelings about their teachers. Only the most important of the measures are included for presentation here in Table 12.

The most highly correlated of the measures was the perception of the teacher's feelings about the students. This is a composite index of three questions about the teacher's reaction to the student. Positive feelings were associated with the approach orientation of all three groups (.554 for black students, .362 for white students, and .254 for Latin students). For the Latin students positive perception of teacher's was also associated with

support for integration. These correlations are all reported in Table 12.

Attitudes towards the police were also obtained in three separate questions and bad feelings on the combined index were correlated at a rather low, but statistically significant level to the separatist ideology for the black and the white students (.201 and .160) and to the avoidance dimension for the Latin students (.264). On some other self-reported measures of contact and experience with the police the minority students', but not the white students' experience, was lowly correlated with both the separatist and avoidance responses. For example there was a low correlation between support for separatism and experience with police using abusive or demeaning language for the black students (.192) and for the Latin students (.225) but not for the white students (.008). The correlation of the same question with the avoidance dimension was .062 for the black students and .249 for the Latin students. Nevertheless, the attitudes of the students towards the police was less closely correlated than the feelings of the students about their teachers.

The next most important group of variables, in terms of their relationship to the two dimensions, was the personality group. All of the personality variables were measured with three to five items which were combined for the results presented here. The sense of control measure is the degree to which the students feel they have control over what happens to them. Self-concept is essentially a measure of the positive or negative view the students have of themselves. Anomie is usually defined as a sense of normlessness but as measured is generally a sense of being overwhelmed by society. The anxiety measures ascertained the degree to which students felt anxiety helped or harmed them in their academic work.

The students sense of personal control and their self-concept were associated with both support for integration and the approach dimension. The

highest correlations were for the Latin students with regard to the approach dimension (.522 and .464). Facilitating and debilitating anxiety and anomie were all associated with both avoidance and support for separatism. The only exception to this pattern were anomie and facilitating anxiety for the white students which were related instead to the approach end of the avoidance-approach dimension and to support for integration.

The "better" students according to traditional measures of academic ability also tended to support integration and to score on the approach end of the avoidance-approach dimension. The measures were: the students' own estimation of academic capability, educational aspirations, grades as reported by the students, and usage of English as evaluated by the interviewer. All tended to be associated with support for integration and approach, particularly for the white students.

Surprisingly the parental and peer influences were minor and inconsistent. Some of the more important variables are listed in Table 12. Inconsistent and relatively low correlations were also found for the demographic background variables such as parental occupation and education. The correlations of these demographic variables may have been reduced somewhat, however, by the fact that several of the students did not have accurate knowledge of their parents educational levels and occupations.

Finally, the actual experiences of the students in the schools were not as closely related to their scores on the two dimensions as might have been expected. The two variables that are listed in Table 12 are the responses to questions about good or bad relations in the schools, and not the students' own actual experiences. The actual experiences correlated very lowly and somewhat inconsistently with both the avoidance and the separatism indices and are not reported here. More research is needed to determine why general race relations in the schools is correlated with the two indices but personal

experiences are not.

In summary, the following conclusions can be drawn from the data presended in this section of the report:

(1) Exposure of whites to minority community members through integrated schooling promotes knowledge of minority community organizations and leaders, promotes support for integration and support willingness to approach minority students.

(2) Latin organizations and individuals are less well-known than black organizations and individuals, probably because less coverage is devoted to the Latin organizations and leaders by the news media.

(3) The avoidance approach dimension is a salient dimension for all three groups of students, blacks, whites, and Latins. The separatism-integration dimension is also important for the black students. Thus support or resistence to integration among all three groups appears to be much more a personal response than an ideological one.

(4) Strong support existed for integration and for approach (vs. avoidance) of the other racial or ethnic groups. This support existed at both the junior and the senior high level and existed in all three groups. Nevertheless more support for integration existed among both the Latin and white students in the Latin-white than for students in the black-white schools.

(5) Support for integrated schools was significantly lower and scores on the avoidance measure were significantly higher for black students in the all-black schools than for black students in the mixed black-white schools. Scores on the ideological separatist measure were lower in the all-black schools, however.

(6) The most important correlates of support for integration and for the approach dimension were: feelings about teachers, personality variables-particularly sense of control and self-concept but also anxiety and anomie, academic variables, and experences and attitudes about the police. Actual school experiences, demographic background variables and parental and peer influences were less highly correlated with either the integration-separatism or the avoidance-approach dimensions.

A final note: Causal inferences are hard to draw, particularly from survey data. In many cases the time-ordering of the variables allows some inferences to be made. For example, if one variable precedes another in time and there is a relationship between the two variables it can be assumed that the latter variable did not cause the first. With appropriate controls to assure us that some other unspecified variable was not affecting both, we can draw a conclusion that the first caused the second. Many correlations and relationships have been discussed in this report. In some cases causal ordering was assumed. In other cases it was not. One of the best ways to disentangle the causal ordering or relationships is to collect data over time from the same students. This is the hope and plan with regard to this research. The collection of additional follow-up data will enable firmer and more concrete conclusions to be drawn about the effects that segregated versus integrated school experiences have on the students attitudes and subsequent performance. Your help in continuing this endeavor is requested.